

Appl. No. 10/708,870
Amdt. dated November 07, 2006
Reply to Office action of September 25, 2006

Amendments to the Drawings:

Applicant requests replacement of Fig. 6 of the original specification with the attached replacement sheet in this office action. Specifically, this replacement sheet corrects typographical errors found on the original figure, namely elements "B29" of "16e" and "16f" 5 are appropriately replaced with "C29". This correction is purely typographical in nature, and is fully supported in the original specification. No new subject matter is introduced through this correction.

10

Attachment: Replacement Sheet 1 page(s)

REMARKS

Regarding claims 1 and 5, applicant has amended “frame refreshing rate” to be the term “frame rate”. Applicant points out that these amendments were made to more 5 accurately reflect the terminology used in the original specification, and do not introduce new or additional subject matter.

Allowable Subject Matter

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 4, with claim 10 claim 4 subsequently cancelled. Applicant points out that the merging of these claims should put claim 1 in a condition of allowance, as the Examiner has stated in the previous office action that claim 4 would be found allowable if re-written in independent form.

Additionally, claim 5 has been amended to be dependent on independent claim 1. Because Claim 5 was previously dependent on intervening claim 4, which has now been 15 included into the limitations of claim 1, claim 5 was analogously amended to reflect this change.

As claim 1 should now be in a condition of allowance, and all remaining claims are dependant upon claim 1, applicant points out that remaining claims 2-7 should therefore also be found allowable as being dependent upon claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests 20 consideration for the allowance of claims 1-7.

New claims 8-11 were additionally added. Applicant indicates that independent Claim 8 was formed by merging all the limitations of claim 7 into the original claim 1, where claim 7 was indicated by the Examiner to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim. Therefore, because claim 8 includes the limitations of claim 7, 25 along with the limitations of the original base claim 1, applicant indicates that claim 8 should be also placed in a condition for allowance.

Claims 9-11 are copied from the original claims 2-3, and 6 respectively, and were only

Appl. No. 10/708,870
Amdt. dated November 07, 2006
Reply to Office action of September 25, 2006

amended to reflect changes with reference to now being dependent on new independent claim 8. Applicant points out that these claims should also be placed in conditions for allowance, as they are dependent upon claim 8, which should be found allowable for reasons stated above. No additional subject matter is entered through new claims 8-11.

5

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,

10

Winston Hsu

Date: 11.07.2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

15 Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)

20